

REMARKS

Reconsideration of this application, as amended, is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-9 are pending in this application. In the Office Action, Claims 1-7, and 10 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over *Whalen et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 5,948,066) (hereinafter, *Whalen*) in view of *Anton, Jr. et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 7,185,360 B1.) (hereinafter, *Anton.*) Claims 8, 9, and 11 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over *Whalen* in view of *Anton, Jr.* and in further view of *Phillips et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 6,763,015 B1) (hereinafter, *Phillips.*)

As indicated above, independent Claims 1 and 8 have been amended so as to further define the claimed invention and Claims 10 and 11 have been cancelled without prejudice.

The present invention is directed to an Internet access control method in a mobile terminal with a built-in web browser feature, wherein the present invention is advantageously able to limit the mobile terminal's overall power consumption by periodically controlling the mobile terminal's unnecessary use of Internet access.

Regarding the Examiner's rejection of Claim 1 under §103(a), the Examiner alleges, among other things that the combination of *Whalen* and *Anton, Jr.* teaches each and every limitation of Claim 1. In particular, the Examiner states that while *Whalen* teaches a mobile terminal having a web browser function, *Whalen* does not teach or fairly suggest temporarily releasing an access to the web server or network, upon failure to receive any web command from the user for a predetermined time after displaying the web document, as presented in Claim 1, and similarly in Claim 8. However, the Examiner uses *Anton Jr.* to cure this deficiency, citing specifically col. 10, lns. 37-45 thereof.

First, *Whalen* essentially teaches a system and method of delivery of an information over

narrow-band communications links. *Anton Jr.*, however, teaches a system for distributed network authentication and access control whereby mobile users are permitted to gain Internet access via foreign data networks.

Regarding the §103(a) rejection of Claim 1, Claim 1 has been amended as indicated above. In other words, nothing in *Anton Jr.* mentions the recitation of “reaccessing the web server if there is any web related operation command from the user when the access to the web server has been temporarily released while displaying the web document,” as recited in amended Claim 1, as set forth above. Rather, *Anton Jr.*, in column 10, lines 37-45, merely discloses a mobile client device (121) and a network (129) where “the network” (129), alone, grants Internet service to the mobile device (121) and forwards all subsequent traffic from the mobile client device to the Internet. Even in its entirety, *Anton Jr.* is silent as to a mobile terminal that includes a feature (i.e., a controller) that reaccesses the web server if there is any web command from the user when the access to the web server has been temporarily released while displaying the web document, recited in amended Claim 1.

Accordingly, as the combination of *Whalen* and *Anton Jr.* does not teach each and every limitation of amended Claim 1, it is respectfully submitted that amended Claim 1 is now believed to be allowable over the combination of *Whalen* and *Anton Jr.*

As to independent Claim 8, the Examiner also rejected this claim under §103(a), citing again *Whalen* and *Anton Jr.* but in further view of *Phillips*. Specifically, the Examiner concedes that the combination of *Whalen* and *Anton Jr.* fails to teach a mobile terminal having a controller, and cities *Phillips* as showing a controller. (See Figure 3 of *Phillips*.) However, in light of newly amended Claim 8, as set forth above, Applicant respectfully submits that amended Claim 8 is patentable over the combination of *Whalen*, *Anton Jr.* and *Phillips*.

The combination of *Whalen*, *Anton Jr.* and *Phillips* fails to teach, mention, or even fairly

suggest the recitation of “reaccessing the network if there is any web related operation command from the user when access to a web server has been temporarily released while displaying a web document,” as recited in amended Claim 8.

Accordingly, as the combination of *Whalen, Anton Jr.*, and *Phillips* does not teach each and every limitation of amended Claim 8, it is respectfully submitted that amended Claim 8 is likewise believed to be allowable over the combination of *Whalen, Anton Jr.*, and *Phillips*.

As for Claims 2-7, 9 and 10 it is acknowledge that these claims are dependent claims; accordingly, if the above arguments place the independent claims into condition for allowance, then it is respectfully submitted that these dependent claims are also believed to be in condition for allowance.

Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that all of the claims pending in the Application, namely, Claims 1-9, are believed to be in condition for allowance. Should the Examiner believe that a telephone conference or personal interview would facilitate resolution of any remaining matters, the Examiner may contact Applicants’ attorney at the number given below

Respectfully submitted,



Paul J. Farrell
Registration No. 33,494
Attorney for Applicant(s)

THE FARRELL LAW FIRM, P.C.
333 Earle Ovington Blvd., Ste. 701
Uniondale, New York 11553
(516) 228-3565

PJF/CEA/fl